

**ADMINISTRATIVE - INTERNAL USE ONLY**

Approved For Release 2000/09/01 : CIA-RDP82-00357R000600100011-7

29 JUN 1976

MEMORANDUM FOR: Deputy Director of Personnel

STATINTL FROM : [REDACTED]  
Chief, Review Staff, OP

STATINTL SUBJECT : Proposed [REDACTED]

Ben:

STATINTL We have reviewed the proposed [REDACTED] and find nothing to conflict with regulations. On the other hand, it offers no particular guidance to employees or supervisors merely stating what "normally" or as a rule" would happen in certain cases. This may well be its purpose, but it certainly leaves the recommending process "moot." As our informal paper on this subject indicated, the basis for decisions on who is approved and who is turned down appears more capricious than reasoned.

STATINTL

STATINTL The contract provision continues to bother me -- if more time is required to [REDACTED] it would seem appropriate to take that time before approving the [REDACTED] To "assess the further utilization of the employee" leaves the reason hanging -- utilization in terms of [REDACTED] social acceptability or employee's job performance? This latter factor should have no relation to the [REDACTED]. However, granting the initial three-year contract provision for whatever stalling reason, the subsequent review at the end of the three years as a cop-out unless security factors are developed . . . which should have caused termination at the time of the findings. This process has quite obviously been a way of avoiding a decision or permitting a questionable situation or job performance to continue. In today's atmosphere of equity among employees -- contract or staff -- this process is archaic.

STATINTL

STATINTL

STATINTL We won't comment on the CI recommendation for assignment to posts of large Communist communities, but it is interesting to note that even here it is "as a rule." Shades of who in the 1950s (meaning level or connections) could visit Yugoslavia and who couldn't.

STATINTL In summary, the DOI is consistent with our inconsistent practices -- leaving the basis for recommendations and decisions in the area of individual (personal) reactions. It is doubtful OP can

Approved For Release 2000/09/01 : CIA-RDP82-00357R000600100011-7

**ADMINISTRATIVE - INTERNAL USE ONLY**

~~ADMINISTRATIVE - INTERNAL USE ONLY~~

STATINTL

STATINTL

STATINTL

STATINTL

STATINTL

STATINTL

STATINTL

say anything negative about the [REDACTED] as written, but we suggest that in a response to DDO a recommendation be made for a thorough review of the policy -- and the practice of reviewing and approving/disapproving requests [REDACTED]. The decision may well be to leave the whole picture as vague and murky as at present, but we believe it is deserving of another review and consideration of a policy which is limited to security standards (how they affect utilization of the employee) of the [REDACTED] itself, not the current or subsequent job performance of the employee. The latter factor is separate and apart from the [REDACTED] and should be dealt with on its own merits. An analysis of approved [REDACTED] vs disapproved in terms of "unique" talents, et al, would, we believe, be interesting! The whole question of [REDACTED]

STATINTL

STATINTL

STATINTL Attached is a draft of a proposed response to DDO on the subject of the [REDACTED]

1/3

STATINTL

Att.

Distribution:

Orig + 1 - Adse, w/att  
1 - OP/RS, w/att

STATINTL

OP/P&C/RS/[REDACTED]:lrm (28 Jun 76)

~~ADMINISTRATIVE - INTERNAL USE ONLY~~